REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments, remarks, and enclosures herewith.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 5-6, 19-24, 26-30, 32-36 and 41-45 are now pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 32-36 and 41-43 have been canceled without prejudice, without admission, without surrender of subject matter, and without any intention of creating any estoppel as to equivalents. No new matter is added.

The Examiner is thanked for contacting us and indicating that the pending claims would be allowable if amended as presently written.

It is submitted that these claims are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. The amendments to the claims and the remarks herein are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103 or 112; but rather the amendments and remarks are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112 ARE OVERCOME

Claims 1, 6, 19-24, 26-30, 32, 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly does not reasonably provide enablement for a composition comprising the sulphamate compound and any tumor necrosis factor-related apoptosis inducing ligand. The Office Action asserts that the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

The Office Action indicates that the instant specification does provide support for a combination therapy comprising the claimed sulphamates and the apoptosis inducing ligand TRAIL. Moreover, the Office Action points out co-administration of the sulphamate and TRAIL is synergistic. Finally, the Office action indicates that claim 5, in which TRAIL/Apo-2L is the tumour necrosis factor-related apoptosis inducing ligand, would be allowable if written in independent form and includes all the limitations of claim 1.

In response, claim 1 has been amended to limit the tumour necrosis factor-related apoptosis inducing ligands to those ligands that bind to TRAIL-R1 and TRAIL-R2. In the